

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 6, 8-12, 16, 24-26, 29-36, and 39-46 are pending. The claims 1-3, 6, 8-12, 16, 24-26, 29-36, and 39-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,667) in view of Gobert (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0080052 A1).

To facilitate prosecution, the independent claims have been amended to recite “wherein a transform coefficient is determined to be near zero when it falls under a percentage of a value calculated using plurality of transform coefficients in the block.” This amendment is supported in Figure 3 and associated description. For example, “Values close to zero or near zero can be determined by identifying values below a set factor such as 2. Alternatively, values near zero may be determined as less than one percent of the average or maximum of all values. The number of one-dimensional inverse DCT operations performed on a block of transform coefficients can be reduced by identifying zero patterns in the block.” (page 10, lines 12-15)

None of the cited references either alone or in combination teach or suggest “wherein a transform coefficient is determined to be near zero when it falls under a percentage of a value calculated using plurality of transform coefficients in the block.” The cited references do not appear to even describe determining near zero values. Furthermore, they do not mention how near zero values are determined. By contrast, particular embodiments indicate that near zero values are determined as those being “as less than one percent of the average or maximum of all values.”

The independent claims have also been amended to recite “requantizing and reencoding video data to obtain requantized video data having a bit rate lower than the bit rate of the received compressed video data, wherein the requantized video data has a bit rate reduced by a bit rate reduction ratio associated with zero patterns.” These amendments are supported in Figures 1 and 2 and associated description. Furthermore, “The motion compensated requantization scheme 120 takes into account the drift in generating the video data 150, and hence provides quality video re-encoding, particularly when the bit rate reduction ratio is large.” (page 8, lines 28-31) “Zero patterns are also predominant during requantization or even during initial quantization with a high quantization scale.” (page 11, lines 28-29)

None of the cited references either alone or in combination teach or suggest “any bit rate reduction ratio associated with zero patterns.” The cited references do not appear to even describe bit rate reduction ratios associated with zero patterns.

Furthermore, the independent claims have been amended to recite a filter applied to the block of transform coefficients, “wherein the filter increases the number of zero values.” This element is supported, for example, on page 11, lines 29-30, “wherein the filter increases the number of zero values.” None of the cited references either alone or in combination teach or suggest applying a filter, wherein the filter increases the number of zero values.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Audrey Kwan/

G. Audrey Kwan  
Reg. No. 46,850

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100